



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK, VOL. XI.

Pp. 1-8. E. Wölfflin, Die Latinität der verlorenen Epitoma Livii. A notice of the dissertation of H. A. Sanders; see ALL. X. 563 and Sanders, Die Quellencontamination im 21 und 22 Buche des Livius, Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1898.

8. E. Wölfflin, Prorsa, prosa. Prosa=prorsa, i. e. provorsa (oratio), in distinction from vorsa, or poetry. Quint. still retained the form prorsa, beside prosa. W. favors omitting the relative clause in *Quint. X. 1. 81, prorsam orationem, quam pedestrem Graeci vocant, since Quint. in four passages of Book I alone uses prosa without explanation. The definition is besides incorrect.

9-26. E. B. Lease, Zur Konstruktion von licet. See review in A. J. P. XIX. 214.

26. E. Wölfflin, Euphemismus als Grund der Ellipse. Such cases as ubi ad Dianae veneris, Ter. Andr. 582, may be assumed to have existed in very early times and are confined to the names of gods until the Ciceronian period. The omission was probably euphemistic in its origin, and no substantive is to be supplied; cf. εἰς Ἄιδου in Greek.

27-35. E. Wölfflin, Zum Asyndeton bei Sallust. The general subject is first considered. Bimembral asyndeton was very common in the Italic languages and is frequent in archaic and archaistic Latin. Cicero uses it but seldom, avoiding it especially in the case of verbs, but his example was not followed. Its use with the active and the passive of the same verb has been regarded as peculiar to Silver Latin, but occurs in Catull. 45. 20. Bimembral asyndeton with adjectives and substantives was avoided by the more careful stylists; cf. Don. on Ter. Ad. 990; but trimembral is common with verbs, adjectives and substantives. Asyndeton of four words is often divided into two parts by the use of words of similar meanings, by alliteration, by rhyme, and by similar devices. Sallust in his earlier work connects the second pair by atque, but later omits the conjunction, though retaining it when a third pair is added. When the pairs are in a disjunctive relation, they are connected by aut, and aut in the first pair should perhaps be deleted in some cases. He also uses praeterea, postremo, denique, etc.; rarely et, -que, and etiam.

Sallust uses bimembral asyndeton more freely than other writers of the same period. On account of his fondness for archaisms, it may be assumed that this was frequent in the lost prose works of the early period. His usage in his different works is not consistent, and it is impossible to reconstruct that of the *Histories* from his later imitators, on account of the impossibility of determining what is characteristic of S. and what is late Latin usage.

35-36. O. Hey, *Actutum*. For *at-tutum, "at a glance"; cf. *ad nutum* and *contutus*, *obtus*. The change of *att-* to *act-* may be due to popular etymology, which connected the word with the stem *ag-*. *Latrocinor*. *Lancino*. Suggests reading the latter word for the former in *Cels. 1. praef. (p. 7. 35 D)*, *mortui demum praecordia et viscus in conspectum latrocinantis (lancinantis) medici dari*, in the sense of "cut in pieces, dissect".

37-59. R. Fuchs, *Zu Serenus Sammonicus*. Agrees with Teuffel-Schwabe that S. follows the best models in his verse technique. This is shown by the variety which he gives to common expressions, by his use of poetical for prosaic terms (for *mare*: *pelagus*, *Doridis humor*, *Nereia lympa*, etc.), in his choice of epithets, of which an alphabetical list is given, and in his use of metaphorical language. An examination of his morphology and syntax follows.

59. R. Fuchs, *Zu Serenus Sammonicus V. 507*. For *scopulosa* would read *scrūposa*, which is found in *Plaut. Capt. 185*.

60. E. Wölfflin, *Bracchium*. *Gracchus*. The original spelling was *brachium* and *Gracus*; the later forms were due to the analogy of *Bacchus*. According to the best MSS, *Gracci* is the spelling of *Quint. in I. 5. 20*.

61-70. W. Heraeus, *Zur Appendix Probi*. Some additions to the study of Carl Ullmann in *Vollmöllers Roman. Forschungen, VII. 145-226*, especially in the way of testimony to unusual forms of common words and the explanation of these by analogies found in the glosses.

70. W. Heraeus, *Lecticocisium*. This word, which is found in *Not. Tir. p. 97. 65 f. Schm.*, should be read in the *Servius-scholia* on *Verg. Aen. 8. 666*, instead of *laeta occisia*.

71-79. R. Helm, *Einige sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten des Mythographen Fulgentius*. F. was of African origin, and Latin was not his native language. This led him to use striking and unusual words, to give the impression of a command of the language which in fact he did not possess. His impression of the originality of the language and style of F. has led Helm to trust more to the MSS than previous editors, restoring to the text many words which had been called in question.

79-80. E. Wölfflin, *Zur Epitoma Livii*. Additions to the notes on the language on p. 1 ff. above.

81-85. C. H. Moore, *Dediticius, dediticiorum numero, daticius*. Notes on the signification of the first word. *Dediticiorum numero* occurs first in Gaius. *Daticius* must be recognized as a late Latin form (cf. *ALL.* V. 429), but *dedicius* (*CGL.* IV. 226. 9) may be a mere error in spelling; though such shortened forms are not uncommon; cf. *ALL.* V. 430 and 434.

86. J. Hausleiter, *Quingenta vota*. In the letter of Celerinus to Lucianus (*Cypr. Epist.* 21 Hartel) for *pro seduta* should be read *pro se D vota*, another example of the use of *quingenti* as a round number; see *ALL.* IX. 184.

87-97. G. Landgraf, *Ueber den pseudocyprianischen Traktat "adversus Iudaeos"*. This work cannot have been written later than the first half of the fourth century and is probably a century older. The form of the citations from the Bible, and the language and style, show that it was not written by Cyprian. It was written in Rome, evidently by an intimate friend of Novatianus, if not by N. himself.

98. A. Sonny, *Magis und minus ohne komparative Bedeutung*. In *Catull.* 62. 58, where S. would read *cara viro magis est, minus est invisa parenti*, *magis* and *minus* = *valde* and *non*. In 73. 4 *magis* has the same meaning, while in 66. 87 and 68. 30 it has the force of *Fr. mais, It. ma*. *Minus* = *non* is found in *quominus* and *si minus*, as well as in *Cic. Div.* 1. 24; *Ter. Eun.* 737; and elsewhere. *Quisquis* = *quisque*. An example from *class. Lat.* in *Catull.* 68. 28. Cf. *Cic. ad Fam.* 6. 1. 1 Mendelssohn and *CIL.* I. 206. 13.

99-103. K. J. Hidén, *Lucretiana*. In 5. 1223 *Lach. membra* is not *acc.* of specification, but is the object of *corripiunt*. In 1. 317 *manus* is not *acc.* of specification, but is subject of the infinitive. An *abl. quique* was conjectured by Lachmann in 2. 372 and other instances are found in 5. 343 and 3. 700. It would be interesting to know whether this form is found elsewhere. An *abl. quod* is frequent in *Lucr.* in *quod si, quod nisi* and *quod quoniam*. Parallel to this is the use of *hoc* as an *abl.* of cause in the combination *hoc ubi*, of which nine examples are given, which are generally emended by the earlier editors.

103-104. G. Landgraf, *Der Accusativ des Zieles nach vocare und hortari*. The oldest instance of a *supine* in *-um*, which is an *acc.* of the goal, is *asom (assum) fero* on the *cista* from *Praeneste*. The use occurs in early Latin with *vocare* (citation in *Cic. Mur.* 26 and *Plaut.*), especially in the juristic language. It is also found with *ciere* and *hortari*, and from its use with the latter developed the rare use of the *acc.* of a substantive with *hortari*

(inc. inc. fab. 63). This perhaps originated in military language. It is especially common in Statius.

105-114. H. Städler, Nachtrag zu den lateinischen Pflanzennamen im Dioskorides. A reply to the criticism of Wellmann (Festgabe für Franz Susemihl, 3. n) on the article in ALL. X. 83, (see A. J. P. XXVIII, 474), followed by a list of corrections based on a collation of codd. Constantinopolitanus and Neapolitanus in Vienna.

114. L. de Vasconcellos, Laticulus. This word, which is not found in the lexicons and supplements, is to be read in CIL. II. 2395.

115-118. A. Funck, Accrementum - accumbo. Lexicon articles.

119-134. Miscellen. K. Sittl, Nimbus, Heiligenschein. The definition of nimbus in this sense in Isid. Etym. 19. 31. 2 goes back to a number of passages in the Servius-commentary on Verg., all of which centre around the note on Aen. 2. 616. Der Namen Italiens. The Romans did not take the word Ἰταλία from the Oscans or from the colloquial language of Magna Graecia, which had a form with *F* (Osc. Viteliu). The Attic form was introduced by Livius Andr., Naev., Enn., and the annalists who wrote in Greek. Ἰταλία was first applied to the most southern part of the peninsula, and its scope was gradually extended between the fourth and the second centuries, B. C. It is first applied to the whole peninsula by Polybius. Italicus (Ἰταλικός) was not used as a genuine substantive. The Romans applied the term to the Allies during the Social War and called their capital Italica (instead of Italia). Italus was first a personal name; after the analogy of Thessalus it came into use through the poets of the Ciceronian and Augustan ages.

A. Döhring, Lat. an = atne. Supports this derivation (proposed by Skutsch, Forsch. zu lat. Gr. und Metr. 60) by an examination of the signification of the word in a number of passages.

W. M. Lindsay, Ueber die Länge des plautinischen "dat". The original inflection of do must have given *dōs, *dōt, which gave place to das, dat. In Plaut. Poen. 868 and less certainly in Most. 601 and Men. 101 we have dās and dāt, while there are no cases in the genuine works of Plaut. of dās, dāt. The vowel was therefore long in his time.

A. Souter, Addenda Lexicis Latinis.

A. Sonny, Totidem = eadem. In Catull. 92. 3 totidem mea is not to be explained, with Ellis, as coming from the game of the duodecim chartae, nor to be emended. There is a parallel in

Hor. Sat. 2. 3. 298, and in the expression *totidem verbis*. Through a similar confusion of the ideas of quality and quantity we have *totidem* for *itidem* in later Latin, while *tantumdem* = *idem* occurs as early as Juvenal (3. 298). The same confusion occurs in the use of Fr. *autant* and It. *altretanto*. *Multus*, *einflussreich*. In Catull. 112

Multus homo es, Naso, neque tecum multus homo . . .

Descendit: Naso, multus es at pathicus

would give to the first *multus* the meaning, "influential" (cf. Gk. *πολύς*), to *multus homo* that of *multi homines*, and to the last *multus* that of "tiresome", comparing Plaut. Men. 316. In the gap at the end of the first line would read *umquam*.

H. Dessauer, *Lupana*. Two examples of this word in Quint. Decl. 14. 3 and 14. 12 according to both classes of MSS, though not according to the oldest MSS: cf. A. J. P. XXVII. 465 and 470. If these works are earlier than Apul. Met., these are the earliest instances of the word.

L. Havet, *Coemptare?* Suggests *coemptabant* for *coemebant* in Cic. Verr. 4. 133 as better suiting Cicero's prose rhythm. The editor cites *promptare* from *promere*.

W. Heraeus, *Atribux*. There is perhaps a connection between C. Gl. IV. 22. 37, *atribux: senex atris buccis*, and Auson. Ep. 22. 19 (cf. ALL. X. 513). In Arnob. 3. 14 would read *atribuces* for *sacrivoces*. *Atribux* is lacking in the lexicons and supplements.

135-144. Review of the Literature for 1897, 1898.

145-148. Vom Archive und vom Thesaurus. Review of the past and plans for the future.

149-196. Th. Birt, *Das Arvallied*. A new interpretation as a prayer for the continuance of spring. B. reads as follows:

Enós Lasés iuváte. (ter)

Nevel vérvé Mármár síns incúrrere ín pleóres. (ter)

Satúr fú fere Márs. Limén, salí; sta, vérvér. (ter)

Semúnís sali térnei ádvocápit cóncotos. (ter)

Enós Marmór iuvato. (ter)

The second line is rendered: "Do not, Mars, allow spring to perish (go over to the majority)". *Limen, sali; sta, verver* = "Gush forth, water; abide, spring". The fourth line means: "the *Salius* shall call thrice on all the *Semones*".

197-211. Edwards-Wölfflin, *Von dem sogen. Genetivus und Ablativus qualitatis*. Extracts from the dissertation of G. V. Edwards, *The Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality*: New York, Evening Post Printing House, 1900.

212. E. Wölfflin, *Zur Epitoma Livii*. Notes on the deviations of the *Epitoma* from the subject matter of the original.

213-220. W. H. Kirk, *Ueber etiam und etiam nunc*. *Etiam* was first a temporal particle. Its meanings are not to be explained on the basis of varying accent in poetry, but on semasiological grounds. In Latin **eti* gave place to *etiam* as the clearer and fuller expression. The new word had only the meaning of the first member, but gradually assumed other than temporal meanings, such as "also, indeed". For greater precision other temporal particles were added: *etiam dum*, *etiam nunc*, *etiam tunc*. Of these only *etiam nunc* became colloquial usage. It displaced *etiam*, which reappears in the archaistic writers. *Etiam nunc* was also incorrectly used of past time, beside *etiam tunc*. From the time of Cic. *adhuc* is found with the force of *etiam nunc*. In Plaut. the two words are written separate; *etiamnunc* is not found until after the time of Cicero. Examples of *etiam* = *etiam nunc* in Cicero's letters are given.

221-249. Landgraf - Weyman, *Novatians epistula de cibis Iudaicis*. The text of the work on this subject found in cod. auct. Lat. I Q. v. 39, in the Royal Library at St. Petersburg, fol. 70-77, is printed with textual notes and parallels from the acknowledged works of Novatianus. The conclusion is reached that the work must be identical with that of Novatianus bearing the same title.

249. J. van de Vliet, *Olim oliorem*. Would read this, in the sense of *ipsa Antiquitate antiquiorem*, instead of *olim oliorum*, in Petr. 43. *Olim* is regarded as an indeclinable personal name. In the following *non mehercule . . . reliquisse* would insert *virginem* after *canem*.

250. A. Woltjer, *A, ab bei Lucretius*. Corrections of ALL. IX. 465 ff.

251-260. W. Bannier, *Zur Chronologie der Dichtungen Ovids*. Notes on Ovid's use of personal names, with conclusions drawn from this as to the dates of the *Metam.* and other works written before the poet's banishment.

261-264. E. Wölfflin, *Accumulate—accuro*. *Lexicon* articles.

265-276. Miscellen. M. Flemisch, *Zu Granius Licinianus*. If this writer's work is based on Livy, he must have used the *Epitoma*, which was made before 30 A. D. Instances of poetic diction and of archaistic Latin are pointed out in his work, some of the latter the result of emendation. A list of other emendations follows.

A. Zimmermann, *Römische Eigennamen*. Suggests that Titus means son, beside Tata, father. Then Titus Tatius would

mean "papa's son". The suffix -ar, frequent in personal names in Illyria, Messapia and Etruria, occurs also in Oscan and in Latin (gens Afraria, Caesar, etc.). Beside these there are forms without -ar (Kaesio beside Caesar). Hence -ar may be a dimin. suffix, derived from the stem *ap-* in *ἄριστος*.

O. Hey, *Zu den Tierlaut-Zeitwörtern*. Since the freq. and the simplex often appear side by side in these verbs (*bombire-bombitare*), in Tert. De Anima, 17, *tonitru meditante*, the correct reading may be *mugitante*, freq. of *mugire*. *Ob civis servatos*. This phrase on coins furnishes evidence for the persistence of the acc. in -is in the Augustan age. From the time of Tiberius *cives* prevails until after the fall of Nero, when the republican formula is revived, doubtless with premeditation.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, XXX (1906).

Pp. 5-30: Jean Lesquier, *Greco-Egyptian Deeds of Divorce*. A detailed study of the formulae employed in deeds of divorce found among the Greek papyri from Egypt.

Pp. 31-51: Georges Romain, *The Law of the Antepenultimate Foot in the text of Terence*. The law of the antepenultimate that was established for Plautus in a previous article (see A. J. P. XXVII 225), is shown to hold good for Terence also. According to this law, the *arsis* (unaccented part) of the fourth foot of the iambic senarius, of the fifth foot of the trochaic septenarius, and of the sixth foot of the iambic octonarius may not consist of an iambic word with shortened ultima (e. g. *mihi*), nor of a word that may become iambic by position (e. g. *bonus*), nor of two shorts that do not belong to the same word, nor of a short followed by a shortened long in a polysyllabic word (e. g. *volup-* in *voluptatem*), nor of the contracted forms *mi*, *nil*, *dis*, *mis*, *ej*, etc., for *mihi*, *nihil*, *deis*, *meis*, *ei*, etc. Of the 74 violations of the law in Terence, 50 readily yield to treatment, whilst the remainder are explained or corrected only with the exercise of considerable ingenuity on the part of the author.

Pp. 51-3: Pierre Boudreaux, *The Lexicon of Lucian*. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca*, II, pp. 317-48, published a *συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ* from the Coislinianus 345. Boudreaux recently made a new collation of this MS, and in the present article points out omissions and false readings in Bachmann's text, and furnishes many instances of failure on Bachmann's part to record in the critical apparatus emendations that he has incorporated in his text. Especially worthy of note are three hitherto unpublished scholia supplied by Boudreaux, and the full text of two other scholia, omitted by Bachmann and but

imperfectly published by Jacobitz on the sole basis of the Vindobonensis 123.

Pp. 54-7: Max Bonnet, On the Letters of Cicero to Atticus (books IX and XII). Critical notes and an expression of the desirability of establishing a uniform practice of relegating all conjectures, no matter how convincing, to the bottom of the page.

Pp. 58-60: Max Bonnet, Juvenal 1, 105. In opposition to Friedlaender and others, Bonnet, following a hint of the scholiast, insists that *quadringenta* of line 106 designates neither the property nor the annual income of the speaker, a freedman, but the property qualification of members of the equestrian order.

Pp. 61-70: J. Vessereau and P. Dimoff, *Rutiliana*. I. The Birthplace of Rutilius Namatianus. From the fact that the name of Rutilius is not found in the inscriptions from Poitiers and Toulouse, it is argued that R. was born in neither of these places. On the other hand, the mention, in the inscriptions, of five Rutilii, one Rutilianus, and one *Exsuperantius* at Narbonne, viewed in the light of the personal and historical allusions of the "*de reditu suo*", makes it probable that Narbonne was the birthplace of the author of that poem. II. The Date of Rutilius's Homeward Journey. The date given by the poet himself is 1169 A. U. C. This, according to the era of Varro, corresponds to 416 A. D., but, according to the era of Cato, to 417 A. D. In spite of the fact that the Varronian era was in general use among the Romans and is the era followed by modern historians, 417 A. D. was the date most generally accepted by scholars before Zumpt's investigations; but as a result of these investigations, 416 has come into general favor. Since the adoption of 416 A. D. leads to other difficulties, the authors of the present article have gone over the entire question anew, and they feel that, when viewed in the light of chronological and astronomical data obtained from other sources, the various allusions in Rutilius point to October 13 as the day of departure from Rome; that the fifteen days' stay at Porto extended from the 14th to the 28th; and that the day of embarkation was the 29th. Only the year 417 A. D. will fit these dates, so that it is likely that Rutilius, contrary to general usage, was following the Catonian era when he designated 1169 as the date of his departure from Rome.

Pp. 71-84: Reviews and Book Notices.

Pp. 85-9. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die griechische Litteratur und Sprache*. Translation by M^{me} J. Weil of the Introduction of this work.

Pp. 90-100: René Pichon, *The Text of Quintus Curtius and Metrical Prose*. Quintus Curtius as a rule follows the laws of metrical prose and is specially fond of the *clausulae* — ∪ — — ∪ ,

— ∪ — — ∪, — ∪ ∪ ∪ — ∪. Pichon gives a list of the instances of non-metrical close in the order of their occurrence, explaining or removing as many examples as possible. As stylistically important for Quintus Curtius is noted the fact that many of the exceptions occur in short sentences, the tone of which is more distinctly narrative than that of the longer sentences. From the point of view of literary history, Curtius's fidelity in the observance of the laws of rhythmical prose leads the author to assign the historian to a comparatively late date, to a period in which rhetoric dominated everything without regard to department.

Pp. 101-4: R. Dareste, The *δίκη ἐξούλης* in Athenian Law. Our knowledge of the *δίκη ἐξούλης* is derived almost solely from the ancient lexicographers; but the action taken by Plesidippus in the *Rudens* of Plautus (a translation of a play of Diphilus) against Labrax, who had sought to carry off Palaestra, the Athenian girl, after having sold her to Plesidippus and having accepted earnest-money from him, is of the nature of an *ἐξούλης δίκη*, and is made the subject of a careful analysis by Dareste.

P. 104: L. Havet, Hirtius, bell. Gall. 8, 4, 1. Read *tota* instead of *tot*.

Pp. 105-7: Georges Romain, Aetna. Verse 69 read *utrimque truces*; 119, aut uno rursus for ac torres uno; 395, experiantur for eripiantur.

P. 108: B. Haussoullier, Inscription from the Piraeus. H. republishes an inscription already edited with commentary by E. Nachmanson in Athen. Mitth. XXX, 391-8, and states that the stone on which the original inscription is found, is preserved in the Museum of Brussels.

Pp. 109-10: Aug. Audollent, Tertullian de idololatr. 8. Read *donum* for *domum* in the phrase *aut etiam domum fabricaueris*.

Pp. 111-22: A. Dieudonné, Delian Account of Melichides. The original of this inscription is preserved in the Cabinet des Médailles. A copy of it was published by Le Bas (Voy. archéolog., No. 2092) in 1848, but Dieudonné presents a more exact and more complete copy together with a transliteration, in which many of the lacunae have been supplied. The text is followed by explanatory notes, chiefly of a prosopographic nature.

Pp. 122-3: M. Roger, The Commentariolum in artem Eutycii of Sedulius Scottus. The supposed Codex Bobiensis of Hagen is shown to be Par. 7830 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and hence Sedulius' commentariolum is known to us by only two MSS, the Zurich and the Paris.

Pp. 124-38: E. Rey, On the Authenticity of Fortunatus' two poems De excidio Thuringiae (App. 1) and Epist. ad Artachin

(App. 3), wrongly attributed to Saint Radegunda. In 1888, Ch. Nisard tried to show that the above-mentioned poems were written by Saint Radegunda and not by Fortunatus, as had been generally supposed up to that time. In 1891, after a partial but careful examination of the composition, style, and language of the poems, Lippert decided in favor of Fortunatus' authorship. Apparently unconvinced by Lippert, Em. Briand, whose biography of Radegunda appeared in 1898, adopted Nisard's view. Rey, to put an end to this superstition as he views it, undertook to complete the investigation begun by Lippert, and has shown that the style, composition, vocabulary, syntax, and versification of the *De excidio* and the *Ep. ad Artachin* possess exactly the same qualities, good or bad, that characterize the authentic works of Fortunatus, and he insists that the inflated pathos and the highly declamatory tone of the two poems do not at all harmonize with the genuine outpourings of a grief-stricken heart like that of Radegunda, but are just what would be looked for in a work of the Italian poet.

P. 139: C. E. Ruelle, *Orphica*, *περὶ λίθων*, 221 Abel. Read τὸν (= αὐτὸν) for the vulgate σὺν or for Schneider's σήν.

Pp. 139-40: R. de Labriolle, *On Tertullian, ad Uxorem I*, 4 (Oehler I, p. 674, l. 14). Tertullian is here not referring to widows but to virgins. Hence the text must be changed either by following the *Vindobonensis* and substituting *permissis* for *praemissis*, or else by returning to the reading of the earliest editions, *quae nulla formae vel aetatis occasione pressae maritis sanctitatem antepununt*.

P. 140: Louis Havet, *Pomponius Mela* 3, 52. For *utuntur* read *uehuntur* and place *armati* after *uehuntur*.

Pp. 141-2: B. Haussoullier, *Archaic Inscription from Cumae*. In the inscription οὐ θέμις ἐντοῦθα κείσθαι IME τὸν βεβαχχευμένον published by Sogliano, *Atti della R. Acc. dei Lincei* 1905, *Notizie* II, p. 377 ff., H. thinks that IME stands for (ε)ἰ μή, and not for με as S. supposes. Haussoullier's idea is that those who had been initiated in the mysteries of Dionysus formed an association and erected the stone bearing this inscription to mark their portion of the burying-ground.

Pp. 143-60: *Reviews and Book Notices*.

Pp. 161-72: J. Bidez, *Fragments of an Unknown Greek Philosopher or Rhetorician*. Publication, with critical notes, of British Museum papyrus CCLXXV. B. used a photograph of the papyrus, and his text was carefully collated with the original by Mr. H. I. Bell of the British Museum, to whom, as well as to Mr. F. G. Kenyon, B. acknowledges the greatest obligations. The papyrus consists of two fragments, each of which is so badly

mutilated that not a single line has been preserved intact. The MS was written for the book-market in the third cent. A. D. It is a copy of a philosophical treatise on the duties and virtues of kings. There is no certain trace of a proper name. In a letter to Bidez, part of which is published here, Gomperz points out that there are no traces of post-Platonic philosophy in these fragments, but that there are unmistakable evidences of Socratic doctrine, and as he detects also numerous references to a king that exercised a world-wide dominion, he concludes that we may have before us the remains of a Socratic dialogue, the remains, perhaps, of the Cyrus of Antisthenes.

Pp. 172: Louis Havet, *Phaedrus* 3, 4, 6-7. For *et . . . et* read *ut . . . ita*.

Pp. 173-206: Louis Havet, *Studies in the Eunuchus of Terence*. Verse 1: Read *si quisquam est hic*, *placere qui studeat bonis*. 3: Omit *hic*. 4: Read *dictum prius* for *est qui dictum*. 7: *Eadem* for *easdem*. 8: *Latina . . . bona* for *Latinas . . . bonas*. 9: This verse should precede 7, and for *nunc* read *nouam*. 11: Comma should follow, not precede, *aurum*. 16: Comma after *erret*, and *ut* for *et*. 37 and 38 are intrusions. 41: Second *dictum* should precede *quod*. 44: Semicolon after *silentio*. 50-7: With Donatus and the ancient MSS place the sigla PA before 57, not before 50. 62: Read *rationem* for *ratione*. 67: *Istaec* for *haec*. 99: *Tu* for *huc*. 107: *Samia* is probably a corruption for some courtizan's name. 132: *Heres* for *hanc*. 152: The reading *nil respondes mi? Tibin?* is suggested. 158: *Haec nunc uerba* is a Hellenism and equals *ταῦτα τὰ νῦν ῥήματα*. 168: Place a period after *repperi*. 169: Semicolon after *dedi*. *uiginti* need not be changed to remove the apparent inconsistency between 169 and 984. 185: For "*non fiet; hoc*" read "*non fiet aut;*". 187: Period after *ibo*; *ego* for *hoc*. 190: Insert *tu* before *Thais*. 196: *animus* in this verse means feeling. 197: Read *forsit* for *forsitan* (so also in Andr. 957); also *paruom* for *paruam*. 202: Insert a second *huius* before *causa*. 207: Perhaps *facito* is to be read for *fac ita*. 211-2: *Istuc* and *hoc* refer to the same thing. 224: *Uide quid agas* is not intended for the master's ear. *stat sententia* forms the close of the master's soliloquy. 230: Insert *haec* after *honesta*. 231: Strike out *hoc*. 232: Put mark of exclamation after *intellegens*. 234: H. thinks that the key to the word *hodie* is contained in Menander's Colax. 238: *me noti* is the preferable order. 240: At the close read in *te esset tibi*. 245: For *his* read *is*. 250: At the beginning read *s<et> et is*. 251: For the first *id* read *idem*. 257: For "*lanii, coqui*" read "*lanii, aucupes*". The false reading is due to Cicero, who de officiis 1, 150, under the influence of Trinum. 407, misquotes this verse of Terence. 260-1: A verse has dropped out between these two lines. 266: Read *has* for *hanc*. 267: Read *St!* for *Sed*. 273: An attempt to explain *ne sis* as a continuation of the reply *Quia*

tristi's. 289: Insert hac after filium. 291-2: Make one line of the two by striking out nescio. 299: amare is a corruption of amo<rem, e>re, which words originally stood before dices in 300.

Pp. 207-9: Louis Méridier, *A Commonplace of the Second Sophistic*. Lucian, *Rhet. Praec.* § 18, gives the following advice to the prospective rhetorician: ὁ Ἄθως πλείσθω καὶ ὁ Ἑλλήσποντος πεξεύεσθω καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ὑπὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν βελῶν σκεπέσθω. Méridier thinks that the allusion to these incidents of the Persian war was a matter of tradition with the Sophists and that Lucian was indulging in a fling at the Sophists in general and at Aristides in particular; for in the *Panathenaicus* of Aristides there are references to the navigation of Mt. Athos and to the obscuration of the sun by the Persian arrows, and in both the *Polemarchicus* and the fifth eclogue of Himerius Lucian's advice seems to have been followed almost to the letter.

Pp. 210-7: A. Cartault, *Horace and Tibullus*. Cartault thinks that the Albius to whom Horace addressed *C. I.*, 33 and *Epist. I.*, 4, is the poet Tibullus, but he is not satisfied with the superficial explanation given of these poems. So he presents what he considers to be a correct interpretation of them. He accepts the hypothesis that the anonymous mistress of Tibullus *IV.*, 13, is the Glycera of *Hor. C. I.*, 33. Tibullus was particularly loud in his expressions of grief over the unfortunate termination of this love-affair with Glycera, and Horace bids him not to give vent to his feelings in *miserabiles elegi*. As a result of this advice, these elegi, though contemplated, were never written. These occurrences took place about 24 or 25 B. C. Tibullus now retired to the country to lead a life of seclusion. Horace, not having heard from him for some time, became uneasy about him, and addressed *Epist. I.*, 4 to him, admonishing him to return to the gay life of the capital and to the pursuit of lyric poetry. In view of the fact that the greater part of the second book of Tibullus is devoted to *Nemesis*, it is not unlikely that Tibullus yielded to the advice of Horace, returned to Rome, and thereupon fell a victim to the charms of *Nemesis*, his last mistress.

Pp. 218-43: Paul Monceaux, *The Works of Petilianus*, Donatist Bishop of Constantine. Only a very small portion of the Donatist literature has thus far been published. In collecting the materials for a volume on Donatism, Monceaux has been able to recover a great deal of this literature, and in some cases, entire works. In the present article, he limits himself to the description and publication of one entire work of Petilianus, to wit, *Petiliani Epistula ad presbyteros et diaconos Donatistas adversus Catholicam*, the text of which, comprising twenty pages, has been extracted from Augustine's *Contra litteras Petiliani*. Petilianus was born of Catholic parents and confirmed in the Catholic church, but he was later won over by the Donatists, and,

though a lawyer by profession, was by them elected to the bishopric of Constantine. He soon became one of the leaders of the sect. At the celebrated Conference of Carthage, in 411, he played a leading rôle. Though the decision was adverse to the Donatists, Petilianus was unyielding. A few years later, he was present at a Donatist council. Of the remainder of his life, there is no record. His works comprise 1, The letter mentioned above, written about 400 or 399 A. D. 2, A long letter that constitutes a reply to Augustine's Bk. I, *Contra litteras Petiliani*. This second letter was written about 401, and the general contents together with some important fragments have been brought to light by M. 3, Other letters and a work on the Maximianist schism. About these we have but meagre information. 4, A treatise *De unico baptismo*, of which there remain considerable fragments. 5, A rich collection of minor speeches, which have survived intact.

Pp. 244-8: Reviews and Book Notices.

Pp. 249-70: Louis Havet, *Studies in the Eunuchus of Terence*. (Continuation from pp. 173-206.) Verse 306: Retain the order *prorsus sum oblitus*. 312: Omit sigla for Parmeno and read *siue adeo* in the sense of "or rather". 316-7: Exegetical notes. 319-20: For *precario* read "*pretio uel, Parmeno, | precario*", and for *nihil* read *nil*. *Flos ipsum* of the Bembinus may be correct, *flos* being neuter. 322: For *amisti* read *amisti isti*. 328: For *hanc* read *illam* (or *eam*) *hac*. 351: Retain *noui* of the MSS and for *ubi siet* read *ubist*. 353: Read *Quis iste tam potens cum tanto munere?* 355: Read *quod dono huic contra donum*. 356: Not *tum* but *-ne* is to be omitted, and perhaps also *nam*. PA. should be placed before, instead of after, *hercle*. 370 (and 741): Read *illi* (archaic gen.) for *illius*. 371: Keep the order *illum esse*. 372: Read *illi* (adv.) for *illis* (*illius*). 375: Read "*facile ut pro eunucho . . . CH. Probe;*" instead of "*facile ut pro eunucho probes. CH.*" 377: Read *pote* for *potes*. 381: *fabā* means *planchet* here, not *bean*; *cudetur*, will be stamped. 384: Read *despicatu, quae nos*. 385: *ab is*. 386: For *patri* read *pati* and for *fieri* read *pater*. 387: Perhaps *factum merito* (DG) is preferable to *merito factum*. 404: It is best to suppress *aut*. 409: Read *homo hominum* for *hominum*. 412: *inritare* for *inuidere*. 418-9: Instead of starting at *Di uestram*, Parmeno utters only *et illum sacrilegum!* 425: Read *quid <tu> ais, homo inquam inprudens*. 447: For *tu* read *diu* and place it before *quod*. 451: at (DGF) is better than *ac*. 463: Read *Itur* for *itura* and put a period after *hodie*. *Bene pol fecisti hodie* is addressed to the soldier. 591: For *ita* read *iam*. 701: Retain *uestem* but place it before *is*, and read *mi* (D) for *mihi*. 772: Retain *satius est*. 781: Read *Tu hos statue hic*. 853: For *admisero* read *admisso*. 1037: Transpose the words *Audin tu hic quid ait?* to the end of the verse and assign them to the soldier.

Pp. 271-4: C. E. Ruelle, *Locus desperatus* in Aristoxenus, *Harmonics*, p. 40 Meib. Read τὸ γὰρ ὑπερβολαίας καὶ μέσης <καὶ τὸ παραμέσης> καὶ ὑπάτης τῇ αὐτῇ γράφεται σημεῖον. The νήτη ὑπερβολαίων of the Hypodorian (lowest) τόνος and the μέση of the Hyperphrygian (highest) τόνος are both designated by the same letter, and the same thing is true of the παραμέση of the Hypodorian τόνος and the ὑπάτη of the Hyperphrygian.

Pp. 275-85: Salomon Reinach, *The Tomb of Ovid*. The famous Italian humanist and poet Pontano relates that he had more than once heard George of Trebizond say that he had read in some good author that the citizens of Tomi had at public expense erected a funeral monument to the poet Ovid before the gate of their town. Rhodiginus (Lodovico Ricchieri), in his *Commentarii*, quotes the fragments of one Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius as his authority for the statement that the inhabitants of Tomi had erected a tomb to Ovid before the door of his house. Against Merkel and Crusius, who consider these fragments a fabrication of Rhodiginus, Reinach champions the cause of the Rovigo scholar. He claims that the information of both Pontano and Rhodiginus is traceable ultimately to Planudes as its source. The mutilated MS that Rhodiginus possessed and believed to be the work of Apuleius, was the work of a humanist of the 14th century. Its sources are two little treatises of the grammarian Apuleius (10th or 11th cent.); some charlatanic scholia on the *Ibis* of Ovid; and a Greek account of Ovid. The Pseudo-Apuleius of Achilles Statius is probably an incomplete and hastily prepared copy of the Rhodiginus Apuleius with fraudulent additions. In conclusion, Reinach expresses the opinion that two verses cited by Rhodiginus as Plautine verses, should be included by the editors among the fragments of Plautus.

Pp. 286-304: Paul Monceaux, *The Works of Petilianus*. (Continuation from pp. 218-43.) Summary of the contents and publication of the fragments of the *Epistula ad Augustinum*. The source of these fragments is Augustine's Book III *Contra litteras Petilianus*.

P. 305: Georges Romain, *Plautus, Captivi* 928. For *ex animo et cura* read *ex animo et corde*.

Pp. 306-7: Félix Gaffiot, *The first six verses of the Eunuchus*. Defence of the traditional reading against Havet, who treated these verses pp. 173 ff. (see above).

P. 308: Louis Havet, *Georgics* 3, 257. Read *fricat arbore costas | aequae hinc atque illinc, umerosque ad uolnera durat*.

Pp. 309-10: J. Marouzeau, *Emphasis by Separation*. Havet (*Mélanges Nicole*, pp. 225-32) established the fact that the effect of the separation of two words that compose a group, by one or

more unrelated words, is to emphasize one of the elements of the group. Marouzeau adduces examples to show that in the particular case of a group consisting of a qualifier and the word qualified, it is always the qualifier that is emphasized by the separation, no matter what its relative position to the intervening word or words.

Pp. 311-2: J. Marouzeau, On a certain Latin Construction. Marouzeau points out that in Terence, Ad. 590-1, with the current punctuation, there would be a violation of the rule uniformly observed by Plautus and Terence that in a relative clause, consisting of subject, copula, and predicate, the order of the copula and predicate is determined by the relative importance of the two. He therefore proposes to punctuate *unum quicquid, quod quidem erit, bellissimum | carpam* instead of "*erit bellissimum, | carpam*" and shows that his text is in every respect more satisfactory than the current one.

Pp. 313-24: Reviews and Book Notices.

Revue des Revues for the year 1905.

C. W. E. MILLER